

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-12, and 14-25 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1, 4-12, 14-16, and 24-25 stand rejected. Claims 17-23 are subjected to an election/restriction and are deemed withdrawn from consideration as not being directed to the constructively elected invention by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Herein, Claims 1, 10, 15, and 17-23 have been canceled. Also, Claims 4, 6-9, 11-12, 14, 16, and 24-25 have been amended. New Claims 26-28 have been added. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16, and 24-28 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)/35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16, and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Nagarajayya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,940,078 (hereafter Nagarajayya). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 10, and 15 have been canceled. Moreover, dependent Claims 4-7 and 24-25 now depend from new Independent Claim 26. Dependent Claim 11 now depends from new Independent Claim 27. Dependent Claim 16 now depends from new Independent Claim 28.

Independent Claim 26 recites:

A method of displaying a visible portion of a user interface for an application program, the method comprising:

defining ***a graphical image for the visible portion*** of the user interface in a first computer file, wherein ***the graphical image provides at least an outer boundary of the visible portion***; defining in a second computer file ***a plurality of parameters for associating a functional portion of the user interface with the graphical image***; and processing the first and second computer files to display the visible portion of the user interface and configure the functional portion of the user interface. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the Nagarajayya does not teach, motivate, or suggest the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 26. In particular, Independent Claim 26 recites the limitations, "defining ***a graphical image for the visible portion*** of the user interface," (emphasis added), "wherein ***the graphical image provides at least an outer boundary of the visible portion***," (emphasis added), and "defining ... ***a plurality of parameters for associating a functional portion of the user interface with the graphical image***," (emphasis added). In contrast, Nagarajayya is directed to changing icon images based on user actions such as moving a pointer into or out of an icon. [Nagarajayya; Figures 1, 2a-2d, and 3; Col. 3, lines 5-20]. Nagarajayya also states that a toolbar is a feature of a graphical user interface and that the toolbar contains icons. Id. That is, Nagarajayya focuses on defining icon images instead of defining a graphical image for the visible portion of the user interface, as in the invention of Independent Claim 26. Further, Nagarajayya is directed to icon images that provide the outer boundary of the icon instead of a graphical image providing at least an outer boundary of the visible portion of the user interface, as in the invention of Independent Claim 26. Furthermore, parameters are associated with the icon images instead of defining parameters for associating a functional portion of the user interface with the graphical image for the visible portion of the user interface, as in the invention of Independent Claim 26. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 26 is patentable because it is not anticipated by and is not obvious over Nagarajayya.

Dependent Claims 4-7 and 24-25 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 26, which is allowable over Nagarajayya. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 4-7 and 24-25 are patentable over Nagarajayya for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27, and 28, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27, and 28 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 26. In particular, the Independent Claim 8 recites the limitation "defining ***a graphical image for a visible portion of a user interface*** for an application program running on the computer in a first computer file, wherein ***the graphical image provides at least an outer boundary of the visible portion***," (emphasis added). The Independent Claims 12 and 14 recite the limitation "wherein each graphics file defines ***a graphical image for a visible portion of the user interface***, wherein ***at least one graphical image provides at least an outer boundary of the visible portion***, wherein each configuration file defines ***a plurality of parameters for associating a functional portion of the user interface with at least one graphical image***," (emphasis added). The Independent Claim 27 recites the limitation "wherein ***a graphical image for a visible portion of a user interface*** is defined in the first computer file, and wherein ***the graphical image provides at least an outer boundary of the visible portion***," (emphasis added). Further, the Independent Claim 28 recites the limitation "a graphics file comprising ***a graphical image for a visible portion of a user interface, wherein the graphical image provides at least an outer boundary of the visible portion***," (emphasis added). As discussed above, Nagarajayya fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the cited limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27, and 28 are allowable over Nagarajayya for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 26.

Dependent Claims 9, 11, and 16 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 8, 27, and 28 respectively, which are allowable over Nagarajayya. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9, 11, and 16 are patentable over Nagarajayya for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, remarks, and arguments overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16, and 24-28) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16, and 24-28) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 7/27/2005 Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060